

killed. More children will be raped;" another \$1 million went to the American Nurses Association, which proudly announces their mission to "lobby Congress and regulatory agencies on health care issues;" \$150,000 went to AFSCME, which denounced the recent welfare plan, claiming it "will drive more families into poverty and turn its back on hard-working Americans who fall on hard times;" \$2 million went to the AFL-CIO, which, over the Memorial Day congressional recess, used that \$2 million to pressure Members of Congress on labor issues. The union's "Stand Up" campaign included radio ads and direct mail.

Now, Mr. President, I recognize that not all of the tax dollars used to subsidize these groups goes directly to political advocacy. And not all of these dollars go to organizations with a political agenda—many are directed to worthwhile charities that are doing the right thing in their communities.

But many of these organizations are really lobbying and political front groups that are taking taxpayer dollars and spending them on political activities.

All Americans are guaranteed the first amendment right to speak out, but they do not have the right to speak out at taxpayer's expense.

Thomas Jefferson made this point nearly two centuries ago when he said, "To compel a man to furnish funds for the propagation of ideas he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical."

Not only are we compelling taxpayers to pay for the propagation of ideas they do not believe in, we are doing it behind their back, and we are adding to the Nation's enormous deficit to do it.

Mr. President, Americans work too hard for their money to see it spent for them promoting political causes they oppose. And they work too hard for their money to give it to lobbyists in the form of welfare.

Now the evidence that this welfare for lobbyists really does exist was never more obvious than earlier this year, during the lobbying reform debate.

When we came close to passing a strong provision in Treasury-Postal appropriations limiting taxpayer-financed lobbying—the compromise provision reached between Senator SIMPSON and our colleague in the House, Representative ISTOOK—our offices came under siege from groups lobbying to protect their special interest.

Now, this is not going to effect the efforts of many major groups such as the American Red Cross, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the American Cancer Society, the United Way, and the hundreds of other organizations which still manage to lobby effectively without financial assistance from the taxpayers will attest.

Mr. President, all the Simpson-Istook compromise does is require Federal grantees to act like true charities.

It is important to understand that there is not an absolute prohibition on

lobbying. The Simpson-Istook compromise recognizes that there are gray lines between activities such as providing information to Congress, and actually lobbying Congress.

For this reason, no organization will be capped at less than \$25,000 and many organizations will still be able to spend up to \$1 million for their lobbying activities here in Washington.

Yet even with these generous limits, opponents have cranked up a propaganda machine unequaled in any debate this year. They have even formed the so-called Let America Speak Coalition, whose members have been quoted as saying that, "If Istook passes, nonprofits will no longer draft [regulations]. * * *

Mr. President, why are nonprofits that receive taxpayer funding writing Federal regulations in the first place?

These groups go even further by calling this legislation a gag rule that is unfair and un-American. But I would suggest to them that free speech is not free at all if Uncle Sam's taxpayers are footing the bill for it.

The amount of disinformation being spread by these groups has been astounding.

We have all heard how those who rely on Government assistance such as students, farmers, and welfare recipients will supposedly lose their right to lobby.

The House language specifically exempts this type of Government assistance—yet the untruths continue.

The Senate needs to pass strict reforms that will require full disclosure of all Federal money spent by grantees, reforms that will truly eliminate all Federal funding of political advocacy.

We also need to stop the political games in which a grantee supports an affiliate who does the lobbying for them. And there needs to be tough penalties for organizations that knowingly violate the rules.

Mr. President, I have no desire to limit the ability of people to exercise their right to free speech—as long as its with their own resources and their own money. But there is no place for taxpayer-subsidized political advocacy in a truly free society.

The hard-earned tax dollars that we ask working Americans to send to Washington should be reserved for those who truly need them, and not to provide welfare for these lobbying groups.

I urge my colleagues to end the tyranny Thomas Jefferson warned against and support real reform that will put money in the pockets of taxpayers and keep those taxpayer dollars basically out of the pockets of lobbyists.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska is recognized to speak up to 20 minutes.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1833

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have been asked by the leader to make the following statement.

I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1833) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I understand by previous order this bill will be considered at 11 o'clock on Tuesday, November 7.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Does the Senator object to further proceeding?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The Senator does object to further proceeding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ARCTIC OIL RESERVE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, yesterday I had an opportunity to take some of the Senate's time in the morning to discuss the issue of the Arctic oil reserve and ANWR, which are, in effect, one in the minds of most people, but in reality there is a significant difference. Let me just very briefly review the significance of this area and put it in a perspective that I think can perhaps be more easily understood.

First of all, we have the area in green and the area in yellow and the small area in red, representing, in the minds of most Americans, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. This is a very, very small piece of Alaska, up near the Canadian border that overlooks the Arctic Ocean.

The significance of this, of course, is that in 1980, Congress acted and designated specific land uses. The uses included putting 8 million acres in a permanent wilderness. That is the area in green with the black slashes. At the same time, they put approximately 9.5 million acres in a refuge. This is represented by the green area. These were placed in a permanent status.

However, they left 1.5 million acres of the coastal plain for designation in the future because of the promise of oil and gas discoveries in those particular areas.

The red area is native land, primarily occupied by a few hundred Eskimos in the village of Kaktovik.

What we have before us is a decision by the Congress on whether or not to allow a sale of approximately 300,000 acres in the coastal plain to take place. In both the House and Senate reconciliation package, we have included the

authorization for the sale. The anticipated lease sale is about \$2.6 billion. That would be split between the Federal Government and the State of Alaska on a 50-50 basis.

What I would like to point out in my description is that the entire 19 million acres is not in question by any means. It is that 1.5 million acres would be authorized for the lease sale, and that portion that would be utilized in the actual sale would be 300,000 acres.

What is the footprint? With the advanced technology that we have seen in the development of the Prudhoe Bay field, which has been contributing about 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in the United States for the last 18 years, we have seen significant development in lessening the footprint. We had a field called Endicott about 7 years ago which came in as the 10th-largest producing field. The footprint was 56 acres. Industry tells us that, if we are lucky enough to find a major discovery in this area, footprint can be produced dramatically. The first comparison was about 12,500 acres, which equates to the size of the Dulles International Airport, assuming the rest of Virginia were a wilderness. Now they say they can do it in about 2,000 acres.

So what we have here is clearly a manageable footprint. We have the technical expertise and the American engineering commitment to do it safely.

So clearly it is good for America. It is good for our national security interests. If one concludes for a moment that in 1973 when we had the Arab oil embargo we were about 36 percent dependent on foreign imports, today we are 50½ percent dependent on oil exports.

What about jobs, and what about the economy? If the oil is there, this would be the largest single construction activity in North America. Probably 80 percent would be union jobs because the skills required to develop an oilfield and provide a pipeline over to the existing pipeline are such that it would provide a tremendous opportunity for skilled workers, and the unions are the only ones that have that abundance of skilled workers.

So from the standpoint of jobs it is estimated that there would be somewhere between 250,000 and 735,000 jobs, and virtually every State would be affected. So it does have a dramatic impact on the economy. Furthermore, it would not require \$1 of Federal funding. This lease sale would take place with private capital coming from the purchasers of the lands, and development would occur from private sector financing over an extended period of time.

There is some suggestion that there are environmental problems. And I would be the first to acknowledge that there is a concern over the environment—a valid concern. But we have the technical expertise to overcome that as evidenced by the development of Prudhoe Bay. Prudhoe Bay is the best

oilfield in the world. You might not like oilfields. But the technology, the application, the permitting, and so forth that are mandated there clearly point out that it is the exception to all oilfields throughout the world relative to its compatibility with the ecology and the environment.

As far as the congressional interest in this sale, the idea of generating \$1.3 trillion into the Federal Treasury is a significant inducement. And as a consequence of that, that in itself merits the consideration and support of this body. However, the real value is to lessen our dependence on imported oil because Prudhoe Bay is in decline. It has been producing about 2 million barrels a day. It is down to about 1.5 million barrels a day. As a consequence, by the time Prudhoe Bay is in further decline, we will either be importing more oil or we will be able to develop some of our domestic reserves. And the most promising one in North America is in this 1002 area which I refer to as the Arctic oil reserve.

Where is the base of support for this? I think it is interesting to note that we have a letter from former President Bush that I think cites very explicitly the concern, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this time, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON, TX,
October 6, 1995.

Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR FRANK: I write in enthusiastic support of opening up ANWR for oil exploration and production.

My support is based on the conviction that we must not continue to become increasingly dependent on foreign oil. A major lesson from Saddam Hussein's brutal invasion of Kuwait is that we must not become totally dependent on foreign oil. Right now we have good and reliable friends in the Middle East, but it is only prudent that we find and develop our own petroleum reserves.

I am totally convinced that ANWR oil can be developed in an environmentally sound way, and that there will be no damage to the caribou indigenous to the area. I understand that some of the same extreme voices that were heard in the 1970s, voices that predicted the extinction of the caribou, refuse to admit that they were wrong. Indeed, not only are the caribou not extinct, but they have proliferated.

In addition, as you know better than anyone, the development of ANWR means jobs for American workers. That in itself is a worthy objective. I hope Congress will promptly remove all barriers to ANWR development.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, to highlight the letter dated October 16 from President Bush, it reads:

I write in enthusiastic support of opening up ANWR for oil exploration and production.

My support is based on the conviction that we must not continue to become increasingly dependent on foreign oil. A major lesson from Saddam Hussein's brutal invasion of Kuwait is that we must not become to-

tally dependent on foreign oil. Right now we have good and reliable friends in the Middle East, but it is only prudent that we find and develop our own petroleum reserves.

The President further states:

I am totally convinced that ANWR oil can be developed in an environmentally sound way, and that there will be no damage to the caribou indigenous to the area. I understand that some of the same extreme voices that we heard in the 1970's, voices that predicted the extinction of the caribou, refuse to admit that they were wrong. Indeed, not only are the caribou not extinct, but they have proliferated.

In addition, as you know better than anyone, the development of ANWR means jobs for American workers. That in itself is a worthy objective. I hope Congress will promptly remove all barriers to ANWR development.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

Mr. President, I would like to show very briefly the picture of the area that is currently producing near Prudhoe Bay. This gives you some idea of the number of caribou which just happen to be in this particular shot. You see the pipeline. You see an oil well being drilled. That oil well and that derrick will be removed. But clearly there is an abundance of caribou. To suggest that the caribou in the area of ANWR will be damaged, or depleted, or reduced as a consequence of activity just does not bear the essence of reality in the comparison that we have had with the central Arctic herd. And as a consequence, Mr. President, it is pretty hard to buy the argument that the caribou indeed are endangered by this.

We have had statements and testimony from former Secretary of State Larry Eagleburger who indicates that it is in the national security interests of our Nation to lessen our dependence on imported oil. He points out the reality that we have seen in the Mideast, Iran, Iraq, Saddam Hussein, Libya—a situation that is very volatile. It actually affects the national security interests of Israel as well, and, if the United States becomes more and more dependent on the Mideast sources, we are exporting our jobs, exporting our dollars, and it is contrary to our national energy security interests.

I point out, as the Presiding Officer is well aware, that in 1990 we fought a war in the Persian Gulf. That, Mr. President, was a war over oil. Make no mistake about it. We have had Secretaries of Energy—Schlesinger, Watkins, Hodel—all very, very concerned about our increased dependence on imported oil. As late as just 7 months ago our Secretary of Commerce, Secretary Brown, put out a very, very interesting and challenging statement that indeed the national energy security interests of our Nation are at stake because of our increased dependence on imported oil.

So it is just a matter of time before we are held hostage by the situation in the Mideast, a situation that will be advanced as a consequence of our increased dependence.

As far as support for this, I think it is paramount to note that in my State of Alaska—I think we have a larger chart here of the State.

The people of the Arctic are primarily the Eskimo people, and they frequent the area of Barrow, Wainwright, Kaktovik. They are nomadic in a sense traditionally. They live a subsistence lifestyle, but as a consequence of the development of Prudhoe Bay, an alternative lifestyle has been available to the people of the Arctic, and that lifestyle has provided them with a tax base. That tax base has provided them with additional necessities of life that you and I take for granted: running water and sewage disposal, as compared to the honey buckets which they previously had—an indoor bucket, and as a consequence the honey bucket man comes around once in a while.

Here is a map of the State of Alaska. Where we are talking about is these areas in the very, very far north. If you look at the map, you will see the Arctic Circle moving across here, so we are north of the Arctic Circle. It is truly a hostile environment. It has its own unique beauty, but living there in a land of permafrost where it is virtually impossible to dig because of the frozen ground, the opportunity for utilities as we know them, running water and sewage, simply do not exist. By providing the opportunity for jobs, for a tax base, these people now have a standard of living that is much superior to what they previously had. They have an opportunity for jobs if they want them. There is job training available. There is transportation available to the Prudhoe oilfields.

So my point is that the Alaska Federation of Natives, which is the organization that speaks with virtually one voice for Alaska's Native community, has come out in support of opening up the Arctic oil reserve for competitive lease sale. There is one group of Natives, the Gwich'ins, that continue to object to opening that up. And this is a relatively small group. Most of the Gwich'ins are in Canada, the area of the Arctic villages of Venetie and Fort Yukon. There are 300 to 400.

Unfortunately, efforts to try to address their concerns of the Porcupine caribou herd have been offset by extreme efforts by America's environmental community focused on the argument that, indeed, in their opinion their livelihood—the Porcupine caribou—is at risk. The proposal is to mandate that no exploration occur during the time that those caribou migrate from Canada into the area. They calve in the general area, calve in an 8-million-acre area, but there would be activity to ensure that there would be no harm to the caribou occurring at that time.

As the picture that I showed you earlier shows, we have a very, very healthy herd in the Central Arctic. What happens to the caribou herds is rather interesting. We have 34 herds in Alaska, about 990,000 caribou. About

three-quarters of them are increasing, about 10 percent are in decline, another 15, 20 percent are stagnant. But as anyone knows who observes the tendency of animals that graze, if some of them overgraze the area, they decline. If there are too many predators, they decline. If there are hard winters, they decline. So they are continually going up and down. But we have had an excellent experience with our caribou, and to suggest that the Porcupine herd would be in jeopardy is just not based on any sound scientific fact.

There is opposition to this by others than the Gwich'ins. We continually see rhetoric by the environmental communities. We have recently seen the USGS develop some new figures relative to what the reserves might be. Nobody knows what the reserves are going to be until you drill, because when you look for oil, you do not usually find it. We had an oil sale out here off Prudhoe Bay called Mukluk. The oil industry assumed that there was going to be a great reserve found there. The bids went up over \$1 billion. Several companies, one of which is no longer in business, bet the farm on the lease sale. They drilled. They did not find oil. The oil had been there eons ago, but it is gone now.

So the Secretary of the Interior has come up with figures that show a substantial reduction in reserves over the figures that were previously put together by USGS showing a higher reserve. The point is nobody knows.

Then there has been suggestion that the State of Alaska is not going to share this revenue. Well, we can reflect on the rhetoric. We can discuss the merits of whether or not a major portion of this area of ANWR will be damaged, and clearly, as I have pointed out, it will not.

Some people say that ANWR would only produce 3.5 billion barrels of oil. Somebody has equated that to a 6-month supply so why open this area for such a small amount. In reality, Prudhoe Bay was a supply that was anticipated to be, what, 200 days or thereabouts? The significance of that comparison is that Prudhoe Bay has been supplying the Nation with 25 percent of its total crude oil production for the last 18 years. So when you put forth an example that suggests it is only going to be a 6-month supply, you are assuming that there is going to be no further oil development anywhere in the United States as far as production; you are going to shut them all down, and therefore this becomes a 600-day supply. That is a bogus argument.

We have seen from the USGS a quick turnaround on a study that was requested by the Secretary of the Interior. The rather interesting thing was that that study was done by the California USGS people. They did not include the extended experience that was accumulated over many, many years by USGS personnel in Alaska. These were people who were trained in Arctic evaluation. Why they were not in-

cluded is something that we are all a little concerned about. The Secretary of the Interior has yet to explain it. As a matter of fact, we anticipate having a hearing into that because it is inexcusable that the Secretary would not use his best expertise to get an evaluation, the best evaluation available.

The rhetoric concerning the habitat is rather interesting to reflect on. As I have said very briefly, there is no evidence that the wildlife would be harmed. That means we do not have any scientific justification to suggest we cannot open the area safely. I have indicated that the Porcupine caribou herd, which is the herd in question, has experienced a vast movement in numbers. In 1972, there were about 100,000 in the herd; in 1989, 178,000; I think today about 160,000 or thereabouts.

Some suggest, well, what about the polar bear in this area? They den in this area. People who know the polar bear know that they do not den on land; they den at sea. If you are a Caucasian U.S. citizen, you cannot hunt polar bear. If you are a Native, you can take polar bear for subsistence. Very few of them are taken. But you can go over to Canada and hire a guide and go out and shoot a polar bear. It might cost you \$10,000.

So when you talk about conservation of the polar bear, why, charity begins at home. We do not allow in the United States the taking of polar bear by Caucasians. You can take them if you are a Native for subsistence only. So I get a little frustrated by my Canadian friends when they give their opinion relative to protecting the caribou. They are very happy to take a \$10,000 bill from a hunter to go out and get a polar bear trophy.

We talk about wolves. We talk about bear. We talk about geese. There are increasing numbers. There is no suggestion that there is any decline in the wild animal population of the area, nor would there be any significant reduction as a consequence of any development.

Some say that this is the only place in the United States where the Arctic is protected. Well, there are 450,000 acres of the coastal plain—this area up here. It is already set aside in wilderness. There are over 1,000 miles of Arctic coastline in Alaska. Very, very little of that area is disturbed. And the production would be concentrated in one area, I think Kaktovik, where there is a small village, a few hundred Eskimos.

There is a radar site. There are two other abandoned radar sites. You would not know, Mr. President, one area from the other along that coast, that plain, because it is so flat and it is so much the same.

Some suggest there is no need for the oil, we have a lot of oil in the world, we can rely further on Russia. Well, as I have said earlier, we have heard from President Bush, Secretary Eagleburger, Secretary Schlesinger. We are now

moving toward a 60- to 70-percent dependence on the Middle East. Too much dependence lets others manipulate us.

What about Russian oil? Well, we have seen in Russia a series of environmental disasters, the Komi oilspill. The environmental record is absolutely unacceptable and in an unstable political situation. We have seen American companies go over there, and the infrastructure is so difficult to penetrate many of them are wondering if they made good investments.

Let me go back to USGS, which is the agency that has the obligation to make forecast predictions with regard to oil and gas in areas throughout the United States on public land.

As I indicated, we are going to have a hearing on November 8. But in 1987 the Interior Department took several years to complete the evaluation based on its estimate of what the reserves were. And we saw a few weeks ago the Department of the Interior come out in 3 days, almost with a back-of-the-envelope study, a study, as I have indicated, where it did not involve the arctic experts they had in Alaska. It was done in California. It was timed to coincide with the committee, the Energy Committee's ANWR votes.

Let me tell you what some of the career scientists over at the USGS have to say about the Interior study.

This came from a lifelong Federal geology professional.

It is all too obvious that this latest ANWR reevaluation is a rather blatantly self-serving exercise in politically directed pseudoscience, a disgrace to the agency and the personnel involved.

And from a current USGS employee in Alaska:

Who is ever going to believe our numbers anymore if we start producing back-of-the-envelope assessments every time the Secretary of the Interior snaps his fingers at us? The Secretary and our director seem dead set on destroying our reputation and destroying the geological division as an organization in pursuit of short-term goals.

Finally, Mr. President, there has been discussion that somehow the State of Alaska is going to renege on this deal, that the 50-50 split somehow is going to be changed as a consequence of State action against the Federal Government. Well, that is a red herring, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from our Governor and a letter from the president of our State senate and the speaker of our State house.

I am going to just read a portion of those letters.

This is from Drue Pearce, State president, and Gail Phillips. And I would ask they be included in the RECORD, as well as that of Governor Knowles. Both these letters are dated October 17.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE,
Juneau, AK, October 17, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER GINGRICH: On behalf of the Alaska State Legislature, we would like to thank you for taking the time to meet with us during our recent visits to Washington, D.C. and for your support of oil and gas leasing in ANWR.

As the Republican leaders of the state Senate and House, we would like to state our unqualified support for current congressional plans to allow oil and gas development on the coastal plain of ANWR and to share lease revenues 50-50 between the state and federal governments.

We are aware that some House Republicans have expressed concern about this revenue sharing in light of Alaska's right under its statehood compact to receive 90% of revenues from oil and gas leases on federal lands.

Governor Tony Knowles announced on September 28th before the National Press Club that he backs the 50-50 state-federal split of ANWR lease revenues as proposed in the budget reconciliation act. He is on record saying he will introduce legislation to change the statehood compact to provide a 50-50 revenue split for ANWR lease revenues.

As the U.S. House and Senate works to complete action on the budget reconciliation act, Members of Congress should know that we will do everything in our power to ensure that such a bill passes the Alaska State Legislature and becomes law.

Sincerely,

DRUE PEARCE,
Senate President.
GAIL PHILLIPS,
House Speaker.

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, AK, October 17, 1995.

Hon. FRANK MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate, Hart Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: During my recent visit to Washington, D.C., it became clear to me that a central issue in the debate related to oil development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) is the allocation of the revenue between the State of Alaska and the federal government. Accordingly, I am writing to you to reiterate my position on this issue.

By your legislation, and that of Congressman Young, you have concluded that fifty percent of the revenues of ANWR should be used to reduce the Federal budget in order to accomplish Congressional approval.

The state is entitled to receive ninety percent of oil and gas revenues generated from federal lands in Alaska. According to your reports, Congressional action is highly unlikely unless Congress sees some direct benefit to the federal budget. In addition to all of the other strong arguments in support of opening ANWR, it has been made clear to us that a fifty-fifty split of the revenue is necessary to attain favorable Congressional action. I support your strategy to split the revenues evenly between the state and federal governments.

If there is federal enactment of the fifty-fifty revenue split, it would constitute an amendment of the Alaska Statehood Act. According to the Alaska Department of Law, an amendment to the Statehood Act requires state concurrence. This concurrence must occur through the enactment of a bill by the Alaska Legislature and approval by the Governor.

Therefore, I will introduce and pursue legislation to accept such a change if Congress adopts a fifty-fifty revenue split. In this way, Alaska's elected officials in Juneau will have a full opportunity to debate the merits of

agreeing to any modification of the ninety-ten revenue formula.

I firmly believe any amendment of the ninety-ten revenue split should apply to ANWR only. I will continue to insist, by way of the statehood compact lawsuit, that Alaska receive its full entitlement on the development of other federal lands in Alaska.

The State of Alaska stands ready to assist you in attaining Congressional approval of opening ANWR.

Sincerely,

TONY KNOWLES,
Governor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair. The first is from Drue Pearce, senate president and Gail Phillips, house speaker.

As the Republican leaders of the State Senate and House, we would like to state our unqualified support for [the] current congressional plans to allow oil and gas development on the coastal plain of ANWR and to share lease revenues 50-50 between the State and Federal Governments.

Further:

Governor Tony Knowles announced on September 28 before the National Press Club that he [supports] the 50-50 State-Federal split of ANWR lease revenues as proposed in the budget reconciliation act. He is [further] on record saying he will introduce legislation to change the statehood compact to provide [for] a 50-50 revenue split for ANWR lease revenues.

Further, Mr. President, a letter from the Governor.

... it has been made clear to us that a fifty-fifty split of the revenues is necessary

Therefore, I will introduce and pursue legislation to accept such a change if Congress adopts a fifty-fifty revenue split. In this way, Alaska's elected officials in Juneau will have a full opportunity to debate the merits of agreeing to any modification...

So, Mr. President, for the record, you have a commitment from the State of Alaska relative to the revenue sharing. And, Mr. President, our word is good.

Now, in conclusion, let me just point out one of the disturbing things that is occurring on this issue. And I find it difficult to bring this to the attention of the body, but for a period of time the Secretary of the Interior has chosen to represent one segment of the issue, and that is the segment fostered by and supported in conjunction with the Gwich'in people, with the backing of the preservationists and environmental groups in this Nation.

The disturbing feature is that now we have a Secretary who is not representing the majority of Alaska's Native people. On the other hand, he is representing a small minority. Somewhere less than 10 percent.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, the Native people of Alaska, the Eskimo people of Alaska, who have lived for generations on a subsistence lifestyle have gone through an extraordinary transition. Previous to the welfare system, to the food stamps, these proud people were dependent on hunting, fishing for their subsistence. As a consequence of that dependence, they generated a small amount of cash from trapping, fishing, for the necessities of life, gasoline for their outboard motors, their snow machines, rifles,

shells, and over an extended period of time, when food stamps came in, where they qualified. So there was a transition. After food stamps came in they did not have to depend to the same extent on subsistence.

I am reminded, I might say by my staff, I said that the Secretary was representing about 10 percent of Alaska's Native people. I am told Gwich'ins consist of about 1 percent of the Native people. So, it is even smaller. But my point is, in this transition of the Native people of our State, as a consequence of food stamps, they have become less dependent on subsistence. Subsistence played a vital role, but they did not have the total dependence. So, as a consequence, trapping was reduced and a little later we began to expand the welfare system.

So, today in Alaska we have a significant portion of our rural residents, most of them Native residents, dependent on subsistence and welfare. Now we are going to cut welfare. Welfare is going to be reduced. We all know that. The BIA, that plays a major role in the lives of many of Alaska's Native people, is going to be cut. Now, these people want jobs. They want jobs at home. These are good-paying jobs associated with resource development, oil and gas. So 99 percent of America's Native people, I should say 99 percent of Alaska's Native people, support, through their Federation of Natives, or thereabouts, opening this area. We have job training capabilities in Alaska.

We have a Job Corps center. We have a good experience of utilizing some of our Native people in Prudhoe Bay. But here is a long-term job opportunity. And the Secretary of the Interior has taken a position against a majority of Alaska's Native people in favor of that 1 percent, the Gwich'ins people who oppose opening up this area for competitive leasing. The justification for that is going to have to be the Secretary explaining to the Native people of Alaska why he has chosen to represent this minority.

Mr. President, I am going to be talking further next week on some aspects that I feel are important to this body. I think what we will do the first of the week is to go into some of the fact and fiction, because America's environmental community has found this issue to be very attractive in raising funding-generated membership.

I was in one Senator's office the other day. The Sierra Club had evidently contracted with one of our Nation's communications firms. The way it worked is that the Sierra Club provided the communications firm with telephone numbers of people who were members of the Sierra Club in that particular State.

They were able to dial in simultaneously, two calls in one. They would phone a Mr. Brown in the State of Arkansas and say, "Mr. Brown, we have the Senator's office on the line. We would like you to express your opinion about the possible drilling in the Arc-

tic oil reserve which would ruin this area and wipe out the animals in the area." Immediately, the call would come in—Mr. Brown would be on the phone—to the Senator's office and be able to log in a call.

This is a pretty significant effort. It costs a lot of money. We do not have those capabilities to explain our side of the story. What we do have is 18 years of experience producing oil from Prudhoe Bay. Where would this Nation be today without that oil, that 25 percent? We would be even more dependent on the Persian Gulf.

We have the finest oilfield in the world in Prudhoe Bay, and we are proud of that. We built an expertise in the Arctic with our geologists, with our USGS personnel showing that we can open this area safely, we can do it compatibly with the environment and the ecology, as evidenced by this picture of the caribou flourishing in Prudhoe Bay. The same set of circumstances can happen in ANWR.

So we have the can-do spirit. The only difference is today we have nearly 20 years of experience. We can make the footprints smaller. We can provide more jobs in this Nation. We can reduce our national security exposure to more dependence on the Mideast. We can provide for the largest single identification of jobs in the United States which will help our unions, help our economy, and, lastly, Mr. President, what it will do is it will address our balance of payment deficits. Half the balance of payment deficit is the price of imported oil.

I want to thank the President for his attention, and I wish he and my colleagues a good day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN W. ANDERSON

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to an outstanding longtime member and president of the Alabama Farmers Cooperative [AFC], John W. Anderson, who retired from his post effective September 30, 1995.

John was named president of AFC on December 13, 1989. He became a member in 1969. During those 26 years, he served in various capacities at AFC, including his management of the Anderson's Peanuts Division from 1984 to 1989.

Anderson's Peanuts was founded in 1933 by John's father, Robert B. Anderson, and acquired by AFC in 1969. Since that time, the peanut division has grown steadily and now includes buying points, shelling plants, and storage facilities in more than 20 locations. It is a major supplier of both domestic and export peanuts.

John currently serves on the board of directors of the Mississippi Chemical Corp., and has previously served on the boards of the National Peanut Council, the Southeastern Peanut Association, Commercial Bank, and Andalusia Hospital. He is a past president of the Alabama Crop Improvement Association

and was selected as its Man of the Year in 1988.

A native of Andalusia, AL, John and his wife, the former Evelyn Wilder, have three grown children and five grandchildren. He has a degree in industrial management from Auburn University. He will spend—and no doubt enjoy—his retirement in Destin, FL, near two of the children. So, they will be properly surrounded by grandchildren.

John's leadership at AFC will be sorely missed, but his friendship, guidance, and example will continue to benefit the organization for many years to come. I commend him for a job well done, and wish him all the best for a long, happy, and healthy retirement.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding we are functioning in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct, in 5 minute intervals.

TAX BURDEN ON AMERICAN FAMILIES

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, several months ago, I was reviewing some data about the tax burden on the American family. I have mentioned it more than once here, but it was absolutely intriguing—one of the thousands of pie charts we see around here—showing the growth of taxes from 1950 to 1970, 1970 to 1980, and so on.

I was struck by this because in 1950—it always makes me think of Ozzie and Harriet, the sort of television portrayal of the average family of that time—and that family, Ozzie and Harriet, would have been sending, of every dollar they earned, 2 cents to Washington—2 cents. And outside of their local taxes and the like, the balance of what they earned they used to house that family, clothe that family, educate that family and provide for the health of the family.

What was stunning to me was if Ozzie was here today in 1995, he would be sending 24 cents of that dollar to Washington and about that much to the State and local government. So that family has lost enormous resources. They work over half the year now for one of the governments; a quarter of the year just for the Federal Government.

When I was a youngster, everybody always told me that the largest investment that an American family will ever make is for the home. That is the single largest investment by far the vast majority of Americans will ever make. That is not true anymore. Now the largest investment they will ever make is to the tax collector. That is the single largest consumer of the earnings of an American family today—the Government.

It made me curious because that is an enormous force and pressure on that